

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2006.

Claims 1, 9, 14, 31, and 34 are amended, claim 13 is canceled; as a result, claims 1-12, 14-24, and 31- 36 are now pending in this application.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 14 and 34 were objected to due to informalities. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the text and figures.

Applicant could not find “the imprinted subsequent of polymer disposed ...” Applicant has amended claim 14, however, which may have been the intended amendment of the Office. Applicant has also amended claim 34.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests the Office to consider the following text from the specification:

cured polymer *lower first film 122*. The lower first metallization 138 is at least partially surmounted with a cured polymer lower second film 146. The cured polymer lower second film 146 includes a second topology 154 (FIG. 1G) that is filled in with a lower second metallization 162. The lower second metallization 162 shares a lower surface with a second lower surface 158 of the cured polymer *lower second film 146*.

The cited text shows that lower first and lower subsequent (e.g. second) films are fully supported in the specification. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims and §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14-17, 20, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Carter (U.S.

6,730,617). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), M.P.E.P. §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 4).

Further,

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaack, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (M.P.E.P. § 2143 8th Ed, Rev.4).

Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 14, 15 and 17 were also rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as being anticipated by Jacobson et al. (U.S. 6,517,995). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 15 were also rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Jacobsen et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al./Carter in view of Walter et al. (U.S. 4,099,913). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6, 20 and 31-33 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. in view of Bulthaupt et al. (U.S. 6,936,181). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 13, 16, 20, 31 and 34-36 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. in view of Carter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

The Office admits that “Jacobson et al fail to teach that the subsequent polymer layer is fully cured after removing the stamp” Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13, 18, 19 and 33-36 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

The Office admits that “Carter fails to teach that the cured polymer first film included a film-to-substrate thickness ratio selected from about [etc.]” Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 12, 18 and 19 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. The Office admits that “Jacobson fails to teach that the cured polymer first film included a film-to-substrate thickness ratio selected from about [etc.]” Independent claims 1, 14, 31, and 34 have been amended to include “*in situ* testing the substrate while attached as part of an array of substrates”. No cited references appear to teach or suggest this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of Cobbley et al. (U.S. 6,545,498). Claim 13 was canceled.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant’s attorney ((801) 278-9171) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,
SAIKUMAR JAYARAMAN
By his Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(801) 278-9171

By /


John N. Greaves

Reg. No. 40,362